

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1702

JAMES MARSHALL SMITH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RAY GODWIN, individually and in his official capacity as Acting Commissioner of the Virginia Department of Social Services; CAROLYNNE H. STEVENS, individually and in her official capacity as Director, Divisions of Licensing Programs; DENYCE BONAPARTE, individually and in her official capacity as Licensing Administrator; R. WAYNE WOLFE, individually and in his official capacity as Licensing Administrator; MARY ELDREDGE, individually and in her official capacity as Licensing Specialist,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District Judge. (CA-03-88-3)

Submitted: October 22, 2003

Decided: November 10, 2003

Before WIDENER, WILKINSON, and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Harold E. Lucas, Jr., Warrenton, North Carolina, for Appellant. Jerry W. Kilgore, Attorney General of Virginia, Judith Williams Jagdmann, Deputy Attorney General, Edward M. Macon, Senior Assistant Attorney General, George W. Chabalewski, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Allen T. Wilson, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

James Marshall Smith appeals the district court's orders granting Defendants' motion to dismiss his racial discrimination action under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981-1983 (2000), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d to 2000d-7 (2000), and the Virginia Constitution and denying his motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Smith v. Godwin, No. CA-03-88-3 (E.D. Va. May 5, 2003; May 23, 2003). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED